

## *REMARKS*

Applicants thank the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given the present application.

Claims 4-20 are now present in this application. Claims 4, 14 and 19 are independent.

Amendments have been made to the Title of the Invention and Abstract of the Disclosure, claims 1-3 have been canceled, claims 14-20 have been added, and claims 4 and 6-13 have been amended. Claims 9-13 stand withdrawn pursuant to an election of species requirement. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

### *I. Priority Under 35 U.S.C. § 119*

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging Applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of the certified priority documents.

### *II. Information Disclosure Citation*

Applicant is concurrently filing an Information Disclosure Statement for consideration by the Examiner.

### *III. Drawings*

Applicant has not received a Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review PTO-948 indicating whether or not the formal drawings have been approved by the Draftsperson. Since no objection has been received, Applicant assumes that the drawings are acceptable and that no further action is necessary. Confirmation thereof in the next Office Action is respectfully requested.

### *IV. Restriction Requirement*

The Examiner has made the Restriction Requirement final, and has withdrawn claims 1-3 from further consideration. By this Amendment, Applicant has canceled non-elected claims 1-3. Applicants reserve the right to file a divisional application directed to claims 1-3 at a later date if so desired.

### *V. Election of Species Requirement*

The Examiner has made the Election of Species Requirement final, and has withdrawn claims 9-13 from further consideration. Applicant has not canceled these non-elected claims since each of these claims depends, either directly or indirectly, from independent generic claim 4, which is believed to be allowable. Upon allowance of independent claim 4, Applicant respectfully

requests examination and allowance of these withdrawn claims.

*VI. Title of the Invention*

Applicant has amended the Title of the Invention in order to better reflect the subject matter claimed.

*VII. Abstract of the Disclosure*

Applicant has amended the Abstract of the Disclosure in order to place it in better form.

*VIII. Claim Amendments*

Applicant has amended the claims in order to correct minor typographical errors, and to place the claims in better form. The claim amendments are not being made in response to any statutory requirement for patentability, and have not been narrowed in scope. Instead, the claims have been amended merely to recite the subject matter therein more clearly.

*IX. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph*

Claims 4-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has set forth certain instances wherein the claim language is not clearly understood.

In order to overcome this rejection, Applicant has amended claims 4 and 7 to correct each of the deficiencies specifically pointed out by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

*X. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102*

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bertocchi et al. Further, claims 4, 5 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kloster et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 4 has been amended to recite a combination of elements in a core lamination structure including coupling means which are formed on each of the respective lamination sheets so as to be connected

together in a row with adjacent lamination sheets. Applicant respectfully submits that this combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 4 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Bertocchi et al. and Kloster et al.

With regard to claim 4, Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant claims that the respective lamination sheets are “**fixedly coupled together by coupling means**.” The language utilized in claim 4 is specifically permitted as set forth in 35 U.S.C. Sec. 112, sixth paragraph.

Applicant submits that Bertocchi et al. does not disclose the claimed “coupling means”. The Examiner consider fixing means as coupling clips (3) & cavities(6). However, lines 12-13 of column 3 in Bertocchi et al. state that “[t]he coupling cavities 6 are arranged to house the clips 3 of the adjacent lamination.” Also, lines 25-27 of column 3 recite that “[t]hey (clips and cavities) could however also be shaped as a recessed female element, for housing the projection portion of the clips 3.” That is, coupled clips (3) are just “housed” (not fixedly coupled) in cavities (6). In other words, Bertocchi et al. discloses a freely engaging relation so that the lamination sheets are rotated through an angle B in Fig. 2.

Applicant respectfully submits that the freely engaging relationship of the coupling clips of Bertocchi et al. is not equivalent to the “fixedly coupled” arrangement in the claimed invention, and therefore claim 4 is not anticipated by Bertocchi et al.

With regard to Kloster et al., Applicant submits that it is incorrect for the Examiner to consider the caulking segment (8) and the complimentary opening (9) of a slightly larger dimension to constitute the claimed "coupling means". The Examiner's attention is directed to column 2 lines 39-44 of Kloster et al., which discloses that the complementary openings are of a preselected slightly larger dimensional size and compatible configuration to nestingly receive the lamination displaced segments of an adjacent lamination in selectively spaced unconstrained aligned relationship. In addition, lines 5-9 of column 5 state that "[t]he stator assembly is then annealed with the nesting displaced segments 8 slightly spaced from compatible openings 9 in adjacent laminations so as to minimize frictionally engaging contact and concomitant core losses." In other words, the recesses are sized larger than projections to avoid frictional engagement. In Kloster et al. they are in nesting relation, not fixedly coupled. However, in Applicant's claimed invention, the lamination sheets are fixedly coupled by "coupling means".

Applicant respectfully submits that the relationship of the segments and openings of Kloster et al. is not equivalent to the "fixedly coupled" arrangement in the claimed invention, and therefore claim 4 is not anticipated by Kloster et al.

In summary, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 4 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Bertocchi et al. and Kloster et al., for the

reasons explained above. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

With regard to dependent claims 5 and 8, Applicant submits that claims 5 and 8 depend directly from independent claim 4 which is allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore claims 5 and 8 are allowable based on their dependence from claim 4.

In addition, with regard to claim 5, contrary to the Examiner's assertions at page 4-5 of the Office Action, Kloster et al. does not disclose or suggest "the respective lamination sheets are fixedly coupled by caulking successively and sequentially," as recited in pending claim 5. In Kloster et al., as set forth in lines 52-57 of column 3, "each stator lamination can be provided at each of the four corners thereof with one of four spaced bolt holes 7, holes 7 serving to receiving through-bolts for fastening outer bearing support end caps-all as known in the art and therefore not shown." However, the caulking is to make fastening by filling or sealing, and therefore Kloster's invention is not fixed by caulking but bolted together through holes 7 & end caps.

Still further, with regard to claim 8, the coupling means fixedly couple the laminated body by the engaging of the coupling portion on the respective lamination sheets. However, as explained above, Kloster et al. discloses that the lamination sheets are bolted together.

Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

### *XI. Allowable Subject Matter*

The Examiner states that claim 6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, and that claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the early indication of allowable subject matter in this application. Claim 7 has been amended as set forth above in order to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph. In addition, new claim 19 has been added which includes the subject matter of allowable claim 6 rewritten into independent form. Claim 20 has been added to depend from claim 19, and which includes the subject matter of amended allowable claim 7.

Consideration and allowance of claims 19 and 20 are respectfully requested.

### *XII. Claims 14-20*

Claims 14-20 have been added for the Examiner's consideration which are readable on the elected species. Claim 19 and 20 have been discussed above.

Claims 14-18 do not recite any new matter, because the original disclosure, in particular, Figs. 6-13, fully supports the recited features.

Independent claim 14 recites a combination of elements in a lamination



sheet including a coupling portion specifically configured to allow caulking of a plurality of lamination sheets in a first direction and caulking in a second direction different from the first direction. Applicant respectfully submits that this combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 14 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, which fails to show or suggest a coupling portion which allows caulking of a plurality of lamination sheets in a first direction and caulking in a second direction different from the first direction.

Applicant submits that claims 15-18 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 14, and are therefore allowable based on their dependence from claim 14 which is believed to be allowable. In addition, claims 15-18 recite further limitations which are not disclosed or made obvious by the applied prior art references.

Consideration and allowance of claims 14-20 are respectfully requested.

### *XIII. Conclusion*

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition

for allowance. Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone James T. Eller, Jr., Registration No. 39,538, at (703) 205-8000, in the Washington, D.C. area.


Applicants respectfully petition under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) and § 1.17 for a two (2) month(s) extension of time in which to respond to the Examiner's Office Action. The Extension of Time Fee in the amount of **\$420.00** is attached hereto.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
James T. Eller, Jr.  
Reg. No.: 39,538

JTE:mmi

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
Telephone: (703)205-8000